



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/511,777	02/24/2000	Okoziem Allen	2204/A14	5651

34845 7590 08/06/2003

STEUBING AND MCGUINNESS & MANARAS LLP  
30 NAGOG PARK DRIVE  
ACTON, MA 01720

EXAMINER

ENGLAND, DAVID E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2143

DATE MAILED: 08/06/2003

13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

3

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/511,777

Applicant(s)

ALLEN ET AL.

Examiner

David E. England

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 – 16 are presented for examination.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 3, 5 – 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The term “first portion” is not stated anywhere in the specification. Although, the specification does state a “left most” and a “right most” portion on page 6 of application. The term “first portion” is an ambiguous term in that there is no determination as to which side would be considered “first”. If Applicant amends the term “first portion” to one of the left or right most portions, it would give the term more direction as to which “portion” is being disclosed and a better understand as to the meaning of the limitation.

3. Claims 1, 8, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The limitation of “the regular expression is selected from a group consisting of wildcard characters, concatenation characters and operation characters,” is not disclosed anywhere in the specification. However, the limitation of “define” is found in regards to the limitation discussed above and it is not clear as to the meaning of “define” and if it is in some way part of a “selection” process.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

1. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chintakrindi et al. U.S. Patent No. 6216159 (hereinafter Chintakrindi).

2. Referencing claim 1, as understood by the Examiner, Chintakrindi teaches a method for representing addressing information in a communication system, the method comprising encoding the at least one address using a regular expression and using the regular expression in place of at least one address, wherein the regular expression is selected from a group consisting of wildcard characters, concatenation characters and operation characters, (e.g. cols. 6, line 28 – col. 7, line 10 & col. 7, line 61 – col. 9, line 26).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

Art Unit: 2143

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chintakrindi (6216159) in view of Ankney et al. (5113499) (hereinafter Ankney).

5. As per claim 2, Chintakrindi does not specifically teach at least one address comprises at least one X.121 address. Ankney teaches at least one address comprises at least one X.121 address, (e.g. col. 9, lines 6 – 30). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine Ankney with Chintakrindi because if a user needed to utilize a system that used X.121, it would be more efficient to have a diverse system with multiple addressing schemes.

6. As per claim 3, Chintakrindi does not specifically teach using the regular expression in place of the at least one address comprises storing the regular expression in a source address field of an address configuration table. Ankney teaches using the regular expression in place of the at least one address comprises storing the regular expression in a source address field of an address configuration table, (e.g. col. 9, lines 6 – 30). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine Ankney with Chintakrindi because it is more convenient for a user to use a name for an address rather than a stream of numbers.

Art Unit: 2143

7. Claims 4, 5, 7 – 12, 13 – 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chintakrindi (6216159) in view of Beser (6189102) in further view of Belser et al.

(6151324) (hereinafter Belser).

8. As per claim 4, Chintakrindi does not specifically teach wherein the at least one address comprises at least one MAC address. Beser teach wherein the at least one address comprises at least one MAC address, (e.g. col. 35, lines 6 – 32). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine Beser with Chintakrindi because it would be more versatile if the system utilized the functionality of a MAC address so a device has a physical address along with a logical address.

9. As per claim 5, Chintakrindi and Beser do not specifically teach wherein using the regular expression in place of the at least one address comprises storing the regular expression in a source address field of an address configuration table. Belser teaches wherein using the regular expression in place of the at least one address comprises storing the regular expression in a source address field of an address configuration table, (e.g. col. 4, line 55 – col. 5, line 8). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine Belser with the combine system of Chintakrindi and Beser because it is more convenient for a user to use a name for an address rather than a stream of numbers.

10. As per claim 7, Chintakrindi and Beser do not specifically teach wherein using the regular expression in place of the at least one address comprises storing the regular expression in

Art Unit: 2143

a management information base. Belser teaches wherein using the regular expression in place of the at least one address comprises storing the regular expression in a management information base, (e.g. col. 10, lines 20 – 45). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine Belser with the combine system of Chintakrindi and Beser because it allows a network manager monitor packets to ensure that transmission is successful and that devices are available in the network.

11. As per claim 10, Chintakrindi teaches wherein the regular expression defines a source address group, (e.g. cols. 6 – 8).

12. As per claim 13, Chintakrindi teaches wherein the storage comprises a routing table, (e.g. cols. 6 – 8).

13. As per claim 14, Chintakrindi does not specifically teach wherein the regular expression defines a forwarding equivalence class for a routing table entry. Beser teaches wherein the regular expression defines a forwarding equivalence class for a routing table entry, (e.g. col. 20, lines 23 – 48 & col. 22, line 60 – col. 23, line 9). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine Beser with Chintakrindi because it would be more efficient if the system were able to forward equivalence class for a routing table entry in case of a network that would be expanded and needed to update a routing table.

14. Claims 8, 9, 11, 15, 16 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

15. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chintakrindi (6216159) in view of Peacock (6381650).

16. As per claim 6, Chintakrindi does not specifically teach wherein using the regular expression in place of the at least one address comprises using the regular expression to specify at least one address of an address pool. Peacock teaches wherein using the regular expression in place of the at least one address comprises using the regular expression to specify at least one address of an address pool, (e.g. col. 3, lines 19 – 40). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine Peacock with Chintakrindi because it is more efficient to have a regular expression to signify a pool of addresses then having multiple regular expressions for a pool of addresses. This could save space in address tables and time in packet switching.

17. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chintakrindi (6216159) in view of Belser (6151324) in further view of Peacock (6381650).

18. As per claim 12, Chintakrindi and Belser do not specifically teach wherein the regular expression defines an address pool. Peacock teaches wherein the regular expression defines an address pool, (e.g. col. 3, lines 19 – 40). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine Peacock with the combine system of Chintakrindi and Belser because it is more efficient to have a regular expression to signify a pool of addresses then



Art Unit: 2143

having multiple regular expressions for a pool of addresses. This could save space in address tables and time in packet switching.


### *Conclusion*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David E. England whose telephone number is 703-305-5333. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur, 7:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on 703-308-5221. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are none for regular communications and none for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is none.

David E. England  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2143

De   
July 29, 2003

  
DAVID WILEY  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100